

## REMARKS

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claims 1-5, 7-14, and 18-21 have been amended. Claims 1-21 are pending and under consideration.

### DRAWINGS

The drawings have been objected to because they allegedly failed to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they did not include a coolant tube accommodating part 31 in Fig. 5.

A coolant tube accommodating part 31 is shown in Fig. 6. Paragraph [0025] in the specification has been amended to state:

The heat exchange fins 30 are formed with at least one coolant tube accommodating part 31 to couple with the coolant tube 23, as shown in FIG. 6.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The drawings are objected to for failing to include the reference sign 'a' in the Fig. 6 and for failing to describe ' $\alpha$ ' in the specification. Paragraph [0028] has been amended to refer to ' $\alpha$ ' as a predetermined angle. Furthermore, Fig. 6 shows ' $\alpha$ ' as the predetermined angle between a longitudinal direction line 'A' and a vertical direction line 'B'.

Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

### REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-14, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,499,514 (Ho) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,452,786 (Anders).

The Office Action states, "Ho does not explicitly teach the details of the heat exchange fin."

The Office Action asserts that Anders makes up for the deficiencies of Ho.

Although Anders discusses fins 14, Anders does not relate to a refrigeration apparatus. Anders is directed to a non-analogous heat exchanger, which is used to increase heat transfer (abstract). Anders fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, "a refrigeration apparatus generating cooling air" as recited in amended, independent claim 1. The alleged teachings of Anders would not apply to Ho because Ho is related to a refrigerator.

Further, Anders describes dissipating heat transferred to the fins 14, 20 by fluid, such as engine coolant. Therefore, Anders does not teach or suggest, "...a bottom end below the corner parts where the inclination angle causes the water drops defrosted by the defrosting unit to flow downward" as recited in amended, independent claim 1, for example.

Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ho in view of Anders, and further in view of Tanaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,715,437 – hereinafter Tanaka).

The Office Action asserts that Tanaka makes up for the deficiencies of Ho and Anders.

None of the references, individually or combined, recite "...a bottom end below the corner parts where the inclination angle causes the water drops defrosted by the defrosting unit to flow downward" as recited, for example, in amended, independent claim 9.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ho in view of Anders, and further in view of Jasper et al. (U.S. Patent 5,552,581 – hereinafter Jasper).

Nothing was cited or has been found in Jasper suggesting modifications of Ho or Anders to overcome the deficiencies discussed above.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is respectfully requested.

#### ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 15-17 have been allowed.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 15, 2007

By: Gregory W. Harper  
Gregory W. Harper  
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501